

REMARKS

1. In response to OA §2, "Priority" a corrected ADS asserting priorities under 119(a), 119(e) and 120 was filed on January 18, 2005, correcting information previously submitted in the original ADS on September 10, 2004.

If the priority is asserted in an ADS, it is not also necessary to assert it in the specification. If the Examiner wishes to add a duplicate assertion by Examiner's amendment, we have no objection.

2. Claims 30-143 have been deemed allowable over the art of record (OA §9). Claims 147-170 are objected to because they are directly (147-165) or indirectly (166-170) dependent on a rejected base claim 146 (OA §8).

Claim 146 has been rejected as anticipated and/or obvious (OA §7). Applicants have amended claim 146 to recite, "at least one" of the limitations of each of claims 147-165. Since 147-165 have been deemed allowable over the art, it follows that amended 146 is likewise allowable.

Since amended 146 is allowable, it follows that the objection to 147-170 should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\g-i\hoib\PEDERSEN9\pto amend aft fnl.wpd